From:
 Abby Morgan

 To:
 Davis, Kris

 Cc:
 Kenneth E. Brewe

Subject: Port Wells Hearing - Comments

Date: Tuesday, May 15, 2018 9:10:45 AM

Attachments: <u>image002.png</u>

Ltr to Peter Camp re Port Wells Developement.pdf

Mr. Camp,

Attached please find a letter from Kenneth E. Brewe of today's date.

Thank you,

Abby Morgan

Paralegal

BREWE LAYMAN, P.S.

Phone: (425) 252-5167 Fax: (425) 252-9055

Website: www.brewelaw.com





The information contained in this e-mail message may be attorney/client privileged and confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us.

The exchange of information through e-mail does not automatically establish an attorney-client relationship. The attorney-client relationship is established only upon the signing of a written Agreement with Brewe Layman. Prior to the establishment of an attorney-client relationship, unsolicited e-mails from non-clients containing confidential or secret information cannot be protected from disclosure. Thank you.

BREWE LAYMAN P.S.

Attorneys at Law

Kenneth E. Brewe Sabrina A. Layman Karen D. Moore Rebecca J. Torgerson Robert J. Miller Kent R. Goodrich Sara M. Epler

May 15, 2018

Ken Evans Mediation Services

COPY VIA EMAIL ORIGINAL VIA US MAIL

hearing.examiner@snoco.org

ATTN: Peter Camp Snohomish County Hearing Examiner M/S 405 3000 Rockefeller Ave. Everett, WA 98201

Re:

Port Wells Hearing – Comments

Dear Mr. Camp:

I am a resident of Woodway Washington and owner of a home in said community. The purpose of this letter is to voice my strong support for Snohomish County's decision denying the Point Wells development application. I join with many others who, for multiple reasons including those stated hereinafter, urge you to reject the Point Wells development application.

- A. The County concluded that the application has many problems with the height of the planned buildings.
 - a) The Proposed tall towers (up to 180 ft.) are out of scale in a single family neighborhood.
 - b) The plans show more than 20 buildings over 90 feet in height even though the height limit is 90 feet unless the development is near high capacity transit. BSRE proposes to build a station as part of phase 3 but does not explain why that should permit them to have buildings taller than 90 feet as part of phase 1 or phase 2.
 - c) The urban plaza is east of the railroad tracks and immediately next to low density zones. County code requires these buildings to be scaled down so that they are no more than a single story as they approach the zone boundary. All 6 of the buildings in the upper plaza are higher then allowed some by more than 100 feet.

Introducing 3,000+ condos in skyscraper style towers (up to 180 ft.) on 61 acres of waterfront property bordering Woodway is totally out-of-scale with Woodway's historic quiet, residential, wooded community of 465 homes and 1,335 residents.

B. The County concluded that the application fails to prove the second access road can be built in compliance with County codes.

P.O. Box 488 Everett, Washington 98206-0488

425.252.5167 Everett
206.971.5555 Seattle
360.419.9191 Mount Vernon
425.252.9055 Fax



- a) The proposed second road access crosses the train tracks, a landslide hazard area, a creek, and a wetland. There is inadequate documentation about how the road will be engineered to successfully cross these sensitive areas.
- b) The proposed second road access crosses private property. There is no documentation about how BSRE plans to acquire the right to cross that property.
- c) The drainage plan for the road is inadequate.

The significant additional traffic (2,000 +/- trips per day) generated by the 2nd street access at 116th St. will overwhelm the capacity of Woodway's limited roads.

- C. The county concluded that the application fails to properly document critical areas including landslide hazards and wetlands.
 - a) The plans ask for a deviation from landslide hazard setback requirements but offer no reasons why alternate plans that follow the requirements are not possible.
 - b) The deviation request fails to demonstrate that ignoring the setback requirements will not result in a reduction in resident safety.
 - c) The application does not include a critical areas' site plan.

With limited access and egress Point Wells and Woodway residents will be at risk in emergencies such as fires, landslides or earthquakes.

D. The County concluded in 1(b) above that the lack of mass transit solution will not allow 20+ buildings that are over 90 ft. tall, In addition, the traffic on existing roads is unacceptable.

There is no high capacity transit at the site to help reduce the dependence on vehicles.

I moved to the Town of Woodway and built a home on a 2 ½ acre parcel to enjoy the benefits of a small town setting amidst a wooded environment that is unmatched given its proximity to Seattle. Flooding the roads with thousands of folks who will be housed in a series of box like structures is startling and inconsistent with the character and feel of the neighborhood. Logistically and practically it does not work. Aesthetically it is a disaster.

Please reject the Point Wells development application and make this letter a part of the record. Thank you for taking the time to consider this correspondence.

Sincerely,

BREWE LAYMAN P.S. Attorneys at Law

Kenneth E. Brewe Attorney at Law

KEB/am